



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/870,057	05/30/2001	Aravinda Korala	0110US-KAL	7161

23521 7590 12/13/2004

SALTAMAR INNOVATIONS
30 FERN LANE
SOUTH PORTLAND, ME 04106

EXAMINER

YUAN, ALMARI ROMERO

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2176

DATE MAILED: 12/13/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/870,057	Applicant(s) KORALA ET AL.	
	Examiner Almari Yuan	Art Unit 2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 January 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 30 May 2001 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>1/10/2002</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Application filed on 5/30/2001 and Information Disclosure Statement filed on 1/10/2002.
2. Claims 1-26 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 24, 25 and 26 are independent claims.

Information Disclosure Statement

3. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 01/10/02 has been considered by the Examiner.

Drawings

4. The drawings are objected to because of the following informalities:

Elements in Figures 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, and 8 should be labeled for clear understanding of the embodiment, for example, in Figure 1, Element 1 should be labeled as "kiosk", Element 2 should be labeled as "display", etc. Figure 2, Element 120 should be labeled as "site agent components", Element 110 should be labeled as "browser components", etc.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the

Art Unit: 2176

drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

5. The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required:

Applicant appears to be disclosing using agents to help with the functionality of a self-service kiosk when receiving web documents. The Examiner cannot find any disclosure regarding a specific example (from start to finish) of Applicant's claimed invention regarding the process of "customization" in the Description of the Invention starting on page 6 of the Specification. There is no description of any specific way of how to obtain the results from using the claimed subject matter of "customization" of documents in a self-service kiosk.

Applicant is advised against the addition of new matter.

Claim Objections

6. Claims 1-9, 11-16, 18-20, and 22-26 are objected to because of the following informalities:

Regarding claims 1-9, 12-16, 18-20, 22-26, the claimed language contains misspelled words such as “customisation”, “customisations”, and “customising”, which should be “customization”, “customizations”, or “customizing”.

Regarding claim 11, the claimed language contains misspelled word “initialisation” which should be “initialization”.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

7. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

8. **Claims 1-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.**

Regarding independent claims 1, 24, 25, and 26, the claimed features “customization activating module” responsive to “customization information” and adapted to activate

Art Unit: 2176

“customizing module”, are not explicitly described in the specification. Furthermore, the specification does not describe much about the “customization” process. The specification describes a self-service kiosk using agents.

Regarding dependent claims 2-23, claims 2-23 are fully rejected for fully incorporating the deficiencies of their respective base claims.

9. Claims 1-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

Regarding independent claims 1, 24, 25, and 26, the claimed features “customization activating module” responsive to customization information and adapted to activate “customizing module” is not enabled in the specification. Applicant is advised against the addition of new matter.

Regarding dependent claim 2, the claimed feature “pointer to at least one customizing software module” for implementing customization” is not enabled in the specification.

Regarding dependent claim 3, the claimed feature “customization information comprises rules or a reference to one rule” is not enabled in the specification.

Regarding dependent claims 4-5, the claimed feature “customization information specifies one or more conditional checks” is not enabled in the specification.

Regarding dependent claim 6, the claimed feature “customization information specifies if hardware device is operable”, is not enabled in the specification.

Art Unit: 2176

Regarding dependent claims 11-14, the claimed feature “identifier dependent module” implementing customization, is not enabled in the specification.

Regarding dependent claims 18 and 20, the claimed feature “customization is to perform transactions”, is not enabled in the specification.

Applicant is advised against the addition of new matter.

Regarding dependent claims 7-10, 15-17, 19, 21-23, claims 7-10, 15-17, 19, 21-23 are fully rejected for fully incorporating the deficiencies of their respective base claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

10. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

11. Claims 1-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 1-26 refers to software per se and recites a self-service kiosk control program that is not tangibly embodied to a computer readable medium.

Furthermore, the claims recites “modules” that is interpreted as software per and is not tangibly embodied to on a computer readable medium. Claims 1-26 fails to set forth physical structures or materials comprising of hardware or a combination of hardware and software with the technological arts (i.e. a computer) to produce a “useful, concrete, and tangible” result.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

12. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

13. **Claims 1-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fields et al. (USPN 6,412,008 B1 – filed 01/1999) in view of Chen et al. (US 6,195,694 B1 – filed 11/1997).**

Regarding independent claim 26 and (claims 1, 6, 19, 21, 22, 23, 24, and 25),

Fields discloses:

A self-service kiosk control program (Fields on col. 8, lines 5-6 teaches kiosk) comprising:

a browser module for retrieving and displaying web pages (Fields on col. 8, lines 4-40 teaches browser used for retrieving and displaying web pages);

at least one customization activating module for activating customizations to default kiosk function, said customizations being associated with identified web pages retrieved by the browser module (Fields on col. 4, lines 31-41 and col. 8, lines 4-40 teaches activating customization functions on a kiosk to customize retrieved web pages based on user's preference, client machine type, current conditions, etc.);

the at least one customization activating module being responsive to customization information comprising information identifying one or more web pages and information identifying at least one customizing module (Fields on col. 8, lines 4-40 teaches customization

Art Unit: 2176

performed on retrieved web pages in response to user's preference for viewing the pages in Spanish from a push of a button);

wherein the customization activating module is adapted to activate the identified at least one customizing module (Fields on col. 4, line 65 teaches customization program and on col. 8, lines 49-52 teaches web page is re-formatted by the client using the return customization information);

and wherein said customization information specifies the address of an initial web page to be retrieved when said customizations are activated (Fields on col. 4, lines 50-63 teaches client sends request for a web page; the request will include client preferences as part of the HTTP header; wherein the HTTP header includes an Internet address).

However, Fields does not explicitly disclose "customization information specifies one or more hardware devices which must be operable before retrieval of the identified web pages"

Chen on col. 7, lines 26-47 and col. 13, lines 34-35 teaches configuration of a kiosk to monitor or maintain the kiosk such as determining if input/output devices (hardware devices) are operational.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Chen into Fields to provide a way to determine if input/output devices are operational in the kiosk, as taught by Chen, incorporated into the kiosk of Fields, in order to provide a effective customer-service environment.

Regarding dependent claim 2, Fields discloses:

wherein the information identifying at least one customization comprises a pointer to at least one customizing software module for implementing said customization and the

Art Unit: 2176

customization activating module activates said at least one customizing software module whilst identified documents are being browsed by the browser module (Fields on col. 4, line 65 teaches customization program and on col. 8, lines 5-52 teaches the customization of the web page is activated in response to user's preference and wherein the web page is re-formatted by the client using the return customization information).

Regarding dependent claim 3, Fields discloses:

wherein the customization information comprises at least one rule or a reference to at least one rule and the identifier dependent module implements said at least one rule (Fields on col. 8, lines 4-40 teaches personal option set to Spanish (rule) to customize the retrieved web page in Spanish version).

Regarding dependent claim 4, Fields discloses:

wherein the customization information specifies one or more conditional checks to be satisfied as a condition for performing said customization (Fields on col. 7, lines 19-24 teaches the server checks to see if any corporate or personal options has been set).

Regarding dependent claims 5 and 7, Fields discloses:

wherein the customization information specifies one or more conditional checks to be satisfied as a condition for retrieving and/or displaying the identified documents (Fields on col. 7, lines 19-24 teaches the server checks to see if any corporate or personal options has been set to customize the requested web page according to the options).

Regarding dependent claims 8-9, Fields discloses:

wherein the customization information identifies a document to be retrieved and displayed by the browser module when the browser first retrieves identified documents (Fields

Art Unit: 2176

on col. 8, lines 4-40 teaches browser used for retrieving and displaying web pages and on col. 7, lines 36-54 teaches customization of retrieved web page).

Regarding dependent claim 10, Fields discloses:

wherein the document to be retrieved and displayed comprises executable instructions and/or script and wherein execution of said instructions and/or script causes the kiosk to perform specific functions relating to the end of a session (Fields on col. 2, lines 40-46 teaches customization tasks).

Regarding dependent claim 11, Chen discloses:

wherein default customization information specifies default functionality of the kiosk and wherein the identifier dependent module implements customization specified by the default customization information on initialization or after each self-service session or responsive to an error or responsive to a set time having elapsed (Chen on col. 7, lines 26-47 and col. 13, lines 34-35 teaches error checking protocols and using timer status).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Chen into Fields to provide error checking protocols and timer status in the kiosk, as taught by Chen, incorporated into the kiosk of Fields, in order to provide a effective customer-service environment.

Regarding dependent claim 12, Fields discloses:

adapted to limit a user browsing capability in accordance with customization information (Fields on col. 3, lines 4-5 teaches utilizing both client-side customization and server-side customization; wherein the server does the customization of the requested web page for the client).

Art Unit: 2176

Regarding dependent claim 13, Chen discloses:

wherein customization information includes a status parameter, and wherein the customization activation module activates a customization specified in said customization information responsive to said status parameter (Chen on col. 7, lines 26-47 and col. 13, lines 34-35 teaches using timer status).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Chen into Fields to provide timer status in the kiosk, as taught by Chen, incorporated into the kiosk of Fields, in order to provide a effective customer-service environment.

Regarding dependent claim 14, Fields discloses:

wherein the identifier dependent module is adapted to detect when a user browses to an identified document specified in customization information and to implement said customization responsive thereto (Fields on col. 9, lines 8-16 teaches customization for Internet Explorer).

Regarding dependent claims 15-16, Fields discloses:

wherein customization information specifies customizations to the visual display of identified documents (Fields on col. 7, lines 37-56 teaches modifying the display of a web page).

Regarding dependent claim 17, Fields discloses:

wherein the identified documents are web pages (Fields on col. 2, lines 40-46 teaches web pages).

Regarding dependent claims 18 and 20, Chen discloses:

wherein at least one of the identified documents can be used to implement a transaction and wherein a customization is to perform said transactions in an order specified by the

Art Unit: 2176

customization information (Chen on col. 3, lines 1-4 teaches reconfigurable kiosk supporting client service transactions).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Chen into Fields to provide a way to support transactions, as taught by Chen, incorporated into the kiosk of Fields, in order to provide a effective customer-service environment.

Conclusion

14. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.


6,014,137 –	Burns –	filed 02/1997
US 6, 318,536 B1-	Korman-	filed 06/1999

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Almari Yuan whose telephone number is 571-272-4104. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays - Fridays (8:30am - 5:00pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Feild, can be reached on 571-272-4090. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2176

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


JOSEPH FEILD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

AY

December 9, 2004